



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,854	06/27/2001	Rodrigo Garces	011727-92.00US	3678
20350	7590 07/15/2005		EXAMINER	
TOWNSENI	AND TOWNSEND	GESESSE, TILAHUN		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	
			DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/894,854	GARCES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tilahun B. Gesessse	2684				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/25/	<u>05</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 10-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-9 and 14-21 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r. ,					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	<del>-</del> , ,	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
	•					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2684

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alanara et al (US patent No. 6,067,460) in view of Laborde et al (US patent No. 5,857,154).

Regarding claim 1, Alanara teaches a wireless communication system having mobile subscriber units within a single wireless network (see figure 2) that may be in either static or mobile modes when operation (abstract) within the single network and a plurality of fixed network devices located at cell sites (cell 1 and 2).

Alanara teaches communicating with both static and mobile subscriber units within the single network (see column 7, line 9-column 12 line 56 and figure 3 and 4), a method for acquiring and managing a plurality of communication modes at each subscriber unit comprising:

Alanara discloses first sensing whether the subscriber unit is static or mobile from the nature and quality of the communication links with nearby network devices (see figure 4).

Art Unit: 2684

Alanara differs in teaching enabling an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit. However, Laborde teaches enabling "multi-protocol" an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit (see abstract). Since, Alanara indicates that provide a signaling protocol between base station and mobile station based on motion (see column 8, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to enable protocol suitable to stationary or moving subscriber unit, as evidenced by Laborade, in order to execute the communication using proper status of the subscriber with proper protocol suitable static or mobile state of the subscriber.

Claim 10, it is a system claim which corresponds to system claim 1 above. Therefore, it is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as set forth in the claim.

Regarding claim 11, Alanara teaches a wireless communication system having mobile subscriber units within a single wireless network (see figure 2) that may be in either static or mobile modes when operation (abstract) within the single network and a plurality of fixed network devices located at cell sites (cell 1 and 2).

Alanara teaches communicating with both static and mobile subscriber units within the single network (see column 7, line 9-column 12 line 56 and figure 3 and 4), a method for acquiring and managing a plurality of communication modes at each subscriber unit comprising:

Art Unit: 2684

Alanara discloses first sensing whether the subscriber unit is static or mobile from the nature and quality of the communication links with nearby network devices (see figure 4).

Alanara differs in teaching enabling an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit. However, Laborde teaches enabling "multi-protocol" an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit (see abstract). Since, Alanara indicates that provide a signaling protocol between base station and mobile station based on motion (see column 8, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to enable protocol suitable to stationary or moving subscriber unit, as evidenced by Laborade, in order to execute the communication using proper status of the subscriber with proper protocol suitable static or mobile state of the subscriber.

Regarding claim 12, it is a system claim which corresponds to system claim 1 above. Therefore, it is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as set forth in the claim.

Regarding claim 13, Alanara teaches the subscriber unit is sensed as static or mobile based on the nature and quality of the communication links with nearby networks devices (see figure 4 and measuring the signal strength of neighboring cells or scanning signal strength of cells).

Art Unit: 2684

## Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-9,14-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach initiating procedures to change acquisition mode from static mode to mobile mode upon failure of the subscriber unit to sense a pre-selected number of consecutive scheduled polling packets sent by a linked device.

### Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tilahun B Gesesse whose telephone number is 571-272-7879. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-2738300.

Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TILAHUN GESESSE PRIMARY EXAMINER